discussion groups formed. In Welsh valleys, in Lancashire and by the Tyne, desolation spread; but in Tunbridge Wells and Bournemouth visiting Oxford and Cambridge economists with Marxist leanings were eagerly questioned, spoke knowingly of trade-cycles, pump-priming and even of dialectical materialism.

Here, bedded in the earth, it was frequently pointed out, were raw materials, and here machines capable of transforming them into useful or pleasurable commodities; here were hands eager to extract these raw materials and work these machines, and here desire for what they would produce. Might not materials, machines, hands and desire be brought together, and the health, wealth and happiness of mankind greatly increased thereby ? It seemed not. They would not come together, despite the ingenuity and labour devoted to that end; only came together when the resultant, instead of health, wealth and happiness, was death, destruction and misery. Derelict factories and shipyards continued idle until war spurred them into renewed activity; in peace they were paralysed, but the threat, and then the reality, of war brought back their life—like an indolent giant who cannot summon up the energy to move his huge limbs except to kill.

Once the National Government had performed the surprising feat of coming into existence, its initiative was exhausted. The lamp had been rubbed, the jinn had appeared, but no instructions were forthcoming as to how its formidable powers should be exercised. The Conservative members of the

Cabinet believed in tariffs, the Liberal members of the Cabinet in free trade, the Labour members of the Cabinet in continuing to be members of the Cabinet, and the Prime Minister in continuing to be Prime Minister. Formulating a policy acceptable to all and likely to impress the electorate, therefore, presented great difficulties.

Economising on public expenditure was all very well, but did not, in itself, constitute a political programme. England, Mr.